



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/081,132

02/21/2002

Michael R. Bloomberg

3524/52

8536

29858

7590

08/06/2007

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
900 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

WEST, LEWIS G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/081,132	BLOOMBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lewis G. West	2618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lewis G. West. (3) _____

(2) Frank J. DeRosa. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 31 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Olshansky (US 6,493,437).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



LEWIS WEST

**PRIMARY EXAMINER
DIVISION 2618**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The condition of the case at the time of interview was non-final. Applicant asserted that there was clear support for claims 21-22 in the specification page 3, Col. 5-11, and the examiner agreed that there appeared to be support for the limitations regarding communication only between authenticated terminals, and that the examiner would take this into consideration in view of the art rejection when the next written response is received from the applicant. Further with respect to claims 21-22 applicant asserted that in the Olshansky reference, only the originator of the call is authenticated. Regarding Claim 1, the examiner's position was that the email and fax applications do not depend on voice communication participation and therefore meet the claim language. Applicant's response was that the claim language was meant to show authentication of a network function, and the authentication of the voice function, the two both being authenticated by the authentication means, but not necessarily occurring simultaneously and neither function depending on the other (the network function and voice function will both be authenticated, but they do not both have to operate). Applicant proposed some minor changes to the claim language including the preamble, which, as presented at the time of interview, appeared to, at the least, make the claim language clearer.

